DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 431 SP 030 962

AUTHOR Oja, Sharon Nodie; Ham, Maryellen C.
TITLE A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision: Project Portrayal. Part A of the Final Report.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire Univ., Durham. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 88
CONTRACT 400-85-1056
NOTE 40p.; University of New Hampshire Collaborative Action Research Projects. For related documents, see SP 030 963-964.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Curriculum Development; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Student Teaching; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This is a report of the development and implementation of a collaborative program at the University of New Hampshire which focuses on the preparation of public school cooperating teachers as more effective supervisors of both graduate student interns and undergraduate students who are exploring teaching as a career. Specifically, the program expects experienced practicing teachers to play a major role in the preservice instruction of teachers, to assist with the continued growth of inservice teachers, and to assume the role of initiator or change agent in curriculum. The report includes: (1) project description and evolution; (2) major issues, strategies, and collaborative approaches; (3) major outcomes and findings; (4) institutionalized features of the project; (5) project implications and lessons learned; and (6) product development. Tables are appended showing the phases of the project, two approaches to supervision, dissemination activities, theoretical framework in collaborative supervision, and a summary of process/content outcomes and assessments. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Collaborative Action Research Projects
Department of Education
College of Liberal Arts
Morrill Hall
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595
(603) 862-2379

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PROJECT PORTRAYAL

(Part A of The Final Report)

1 October 1988

Sharon Nodie Oja, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Associate Professor of Education
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595

Maryellen C. Ham, Ed.D., Project Director
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Colchester, Vermont 05446

Final Report: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

Part A: Project Portrayal
Part B: Program Assessment Report
Part C: Practice Profile

Project funded by:

U.S. Department of Education ED. No. 400-85-1056
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
October, 1985 to September, 1988

The work upon which this final report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. OEC-5-10-154 of the Office of Educational Research and Development. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND EVOLUTION.....2

University and Public School Context Issues.....2
Planning and Development Phase.....3
Implementation and Demonstration Phase.....4
Dissemination and Evaluation Phase.....5

MAJOR ISSUES, STRATEGIES, AND COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES..6

Anticipated Issues.....7
Unanticipated Issues.....7
Strategies.....7
Collaborative Approaches.....8

MAJOR OUTCOMES/FINDINGS.....8

Individual Supervision Groups.....9
University/Public School Collaboration.....10

INSTITUTIONALIZED FEATURES OF THIS PROJECT.....11

PROJECT IMPLICATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....12

Staff Development.....13
Personal and Organizational Collaboration.....14
Educational Change.....16

PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT.....17

APPENDIX.....19

Table 1: Phases in A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO SUPERVISION.....20
Table 2: Two Approaches to Supervision.....21
Table 3: Dissemination Activities.....22
Table 4: Theoretical Framework in Collaborative Supervision.....23
Table 5: Summary of Process/Content Outcomes and Assessments.....24

Competencies and Behavioral Indicators in Adult Development, Supervision, and Collaboration.....25
Formal Measures in Assessing Adult Development.....26
Project Profile: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION.....27

PROJECT PORTRAYAL
A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND EVOLUTION

For many decades, teacher education has followed traditional models. Training typically consists of four years of college with a brief period of student teaching, and with periodic assessments based upon limited observations and often inconsistent goals. Recently, with increased attention focused on the quality of teacher education, conventional models are being questioned. In response, a number of states and universities have established more innovative teacher education programs. Locally, the University of New Hampshire (UNH) has experienced significant success in its extended five year teacher preparation program which was initiated in 1975. Since public school professionals play a major role in the implementation of the UNH program, this collaborative Project focused on the preparation of cooperating teachers as more effective supervisors of both graduate student interns and undergraduate students who are exploring teaching as a career option. Entitled A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION, this Project included three phases over a three year period. Table 1 in the Appendix of this report identifies each of these phases, and lists their specific goals and objectives.

University and Public School District Context Issues

The process of change in the Teacher Education Program at the University of New Hampshire was documented in a paper written by Michael D. Andrew, UNH Director of Teacher Education, for delivery to the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education in October, 1984. In this paper, Andrew emphasizes that teacher leadership is one of the central objectives in the Five Year Program at UNH. Specifically, the program expects teachers to play a major role in the preservice instruction of teachers, to assist with the continued growth of inservice teachers, and to assume the role of initiator or change agent in curriculum. The following paragraphs describe the three components of the UNH Teacher Education Program where public school teachers assume specific leadership functions:

> EXPLORING TEACHING: an undergraduate course, usually taken during the sophomore year, designed to explore teaching and to decide whether teaching is a realistic career choice.

PROFESSIONAL COURSEWORK: normally begun in the junior year, students are required to take a minimum of four credits to be completed in each of the following areas: Educational Structure and Change, Human Development and Learning, Alternative Teaching Models, and Alternative Perspectives on the Nature of Education.

GRADUATE INTERNSHIP: the final component in the teacher education program consists of a full year post-baccalaureate internship as well as graduate study related to the student's chosen subject area and/or level of teaching.

The University of New Hampshire is located in Durham, a town which is part of School Administrative Unit #56, along with the city of Somersworth and three other towns (Lee, Madbury, and Rollinsford). Somersworth and Rollinsford are basically working class, blue collar communities with scarce resources for education. Durham, Lee, and Madbury surround the University, many faculty members reside in these towns, and they are basically bedroom communities with high percentages of working professional people. SAU #56 includes the following elementary schools which served as sites for this collaborative school/university Project: Oyster River Elementary, Maple Wood School, Hilltop School, Great Falls School, and Rollinsford Grade School.

While the UNH Teacher Education Committee focused on refining its collaborative strategies with public schools during school year 1984-85, the Superintendent and administrators in NH School Administrative Unit #56 identified the concept of differentiated supervision as a District goal. Occurring simultaneously, the individual goals of these two separate groups provided fertile ground for the initiation and development of the Project, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION.

Project Planning and Development Phase

During the planning and development phase of this Project, the Project Director, Principal Investigator, and participants collaboratively focused on three major objectives:

1. Establishing the Project's theoretical framework which included investigating theories of adult cognitive development and alternative models of supervision.

2. Modeling and participating in a process of collaborative action research.

3. Creating a Principal Leadership Group (PLG) and several Teacher Supervision Groups (TSGs) which would continue to function throughout the three years of this Project and perhaps beyond the life of the Project.

During this phase, five elementary and two middle school principals met regularly with the Principal Investigator and Project Director to explore issues in adult development, to practice using a variety of supervisory models/strategies, and to reflect upon the match and/or mismatch between teacher stages of development and certain supervisory practices. PLG members also played a major role in helping to structure the Teacher Supervision Groups for each school. Three of these principals met regularly with the individual TSGs from their schools during this phase.

All Teacher Supervision Groups initially focused on increasing the flexibility of classroom teachers by examining and demonstrating various models of supervision within the framework of adult cognitive stages of development. The teachers and principals in each school collaboratively decided the most appropriate way for them to function as a group. This process resulted in the development of some unique group norms and operating procedures which remained consistent throughout the Project.

Project Implementation and Demonstration Phase

As a result of the data gathered in the evaluation meetings and through questionnaires completed at the end of the Planning and Development Phase, a Public School/University Task Force for improved supervision was formed. This group included representatives of the teachers, principals, University faculty, and Project staff. Task Force members discussed not only the implications of this Project relative to the UNH Teacher Education Program, but also some specific strategies for refining the supervisory skills of classroom teachers as they assume increased responsibilities for the supervision of graduate level interns. Initially, this Task Force created two different school-based approaches to the process of collaborative teacher supervision. The Durham Teacher Supervision Group (TSG-3) chose to experiment with a more egalitarian approach, while the Somersworth Teacher Supervision Group (TSG-2) chose a more differentiated approach. An outline of the responsibilities defined by Task Force members in each of these two approaches appears in Table 2 in the Appendix.

During the Development and Implementation Phase, both the Principal Leadership Group and the Teacher Supervision Groups continued to meet. The PLG focused on matching alternative supervision models to the needs of individual teachers in their schools. Through the use of logs and journals, principals were encouraged to match teacher cognitive stages of adult development with appropriate supervisory strategies. During the fall semester of this Phase, a total of forty-six UNH students were placed with cooperating teachers in the elementary and middle schools in SAU #56. At this time, twenty-one cooperating teachers were actively participating in regular Project meetings. In addition, four classroom teachers assumed the added responsibility of serving as Course Collaborators. They met weekly with a UNH adjunct faculty member and a seminar of twenty students enrolled in the Exploring Teaching course. Like the principals, all teacher participants completed supervisory logs and journals to document their effectiveness in appropriately matching student cognitive stages of development with supervision practices. Also during this phase. one TSG group focused a great deal of time and energy creating a checklist of competencies useful in assessing instructional leadership or supervision skills, knowledge of adult development, and the ability to engage in collaborative processes. Copies of all the instruments and tools used to collect data during this Phase are included in the Appendix to this report.

Project Dissemination and Evaluation Phase

Collaborative group meetings among principals, teachers, and School/University Task Force members continued throughout the third year of this Project. Flexible meeting formats encouraged and facilitated evaluation discussions which focused on: 1) teacher success in matching alternative supevision strategies to the needs of graduate student interns; 2) the success of principals in matching adult developmental needs to appropriate supervision practices; and 3) the process of collaborative action research modeled and practiced throughout this Project. These discussions resulted in a series of decisions regarding the institutionalization of the most effective Project practices. All participants agreed that specific school/university context issues, administrative support, and sustained leadership will determine the future impact of these decisions.

Several times during this phase the Project Director and Principal Investigator discussed with all participants our need to increase evaluative data, especially quantitative data. Collaboratively, the group decided to contract the services of

a consultant whose function would be threefold: to visit each Project site and informally meet interns; to interview several Project teachers, principals, some university faculty, and the Project staff; and to write a summary report of her findings on the implementation of the components in the Project's Practice Profile (see Appendix). This outside evaluation was conducted during April, 1988. In addition to this evaluator's report, a graduate student trained in qualitative data collection and knowledgable about adult development was hired to interview each of the graduate student interns currently being supervised by a Project cooperating teacher. In conjunction with these evaluation reports, Project participants completed three formal measures of adult development (Loevinger's Test of Ego Development, Rest's Defining Issues Test, and Hunt's Paragraph Completion Test), as well as a Final Project Evaluation Survey. This Survey was designed to quantify, verify, prioritize, and clarify the data recorded in the outside evaluator's report. The Principal Investigator also randomly interviewed a number of individual Project teachers and principals.

Throughout the final year of this Project, a number of teacher and principal participants as well as the Project staff were involved in dissemination activities at the local, regional, and national levels. Table 3 delineates the varied nature of these presentations and the wide range of audiences addressed by Project participants.

MAJOR ISSUES, STRATEGIES, AND COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES

In the original proposal for A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION, several major issues, strategies, and approaches to collaboration were identified as central to the Project's success. These focus areas addressed both content and process concerns. In terms of content, for example, participating teachers, principals, and university supervisors increased their knowledge bases in adult development, alternative models of supervision, and collaborative action research. Teachers applied their new learning by supervising fifth year graduate interns, student teachers, peers, and/or undergraduate students participating in a course designed to explore teaching as a profession. In their roles as instructional leaders and supervisors, principals applied this knowledge base as they worked with classroom teachers in their schools and with one another. University supervisors applied their new learnings by working more collaboratively with public school teachers and administrators, and by assuming colleague consultation roles with other teacher education faculty members. In terms of

process, all participants functioned collaboratively to develop strategies for gathering data, applying research, and implementing findings.

Project planning and development activities initially focused on identifying specific strategies and approaches in each of the Project's content (adult development and alternative models of supervision) and process (collaborative action research) goals. During the implementation phase of the Project, however, several unanticipated issues surfaced, illustrating the underlying concept of recursion or "ongoing tentativeness" which is basic to action research projects. Recursion implies that data is subject to continuous, dynamic revision. As this Project developed, the recursion process permitted participants to consider additional needs and to expand our initial parameters. While Table 4 provides a summary of the Project's theoretical framework, the following outline identifies both the anticipated and unanticipated major issues in this Project as well as some of the specific strategies and collaborative approaches developed by the Project participants.

ANTICIPATED ISSUES

- Form Principal Leadership Group
- Develop Teacher Supervision Groups
- Investigate Adult Development Content
- Study Alternative Suprvisory Models
- Enhance Role of Cooperating Teachers
- Increase University/Public School Communication

UNANTICIPATED ISSUES

- Creating School/University Task Force on Supervision
- Teaching Theories of Adult Development to University Supervisors
- Impact of School Context Issues in TSG Activities
- Power of School/District Administrative Involvement

STRATEGIES

- Flexible Meeting Formats (time, place, frequency)
- Cooperative Agendas; Joint Planning
- Multiple Data Collection Sources
- Outside Consultants; Evaluators
- Individual Participant Research Projects
- Cluster Placement of Interns and ED 500 Students
- Broad Individual/Group Participation in Dissemination Activities

COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES

- Action Research Process as Focus
- Alternative TSG Structures (Differentiated; Egalitarian)
- Recruitment of University Supervisors for Intern Clusters
- Refinement of Intern Selection/Placement Process
- Development of Collaborative Supervision Concept Creation of Competencies Checklist
- Refinement of the Matching Model Concept

MAJOR OUTCOMES/FINDINGS

This Project focused on improving the ability of participants to recognize individual developmental needs and to provide their supervisees with both the supports and challenges needed to enhance growth. Project staff investigated the degree to which teachers and principals learned and applied this collaborative supervision model. Findings indicate that approximately half of those public school educators who participated in this Project all three years attempted and achieved success in implementing the ideal collaborative supervision model outlined in our Project Profile (See Appendix). This assessment is based upon observations, self-reports, journals, individual interviews, and competency ratings. Since learning and implementing developmental theory and alternative supervision models was the major Project focus, findings reveal that our Project was only partially successful. It could be argued, however, that there are alternative ways for principals and cooperating teachers as supervisors to match individual needs with supervision models.

In this Project, for example, one supervision group defined "needs" as the intern's need to see many different teaching styles and need to experience the collaboration of working together on a mutually defined project in the school. The second supervision group, however, defined "needs" as the cognitive-developmental needs of supervisees in the areas of ego, moral, conceptual, and interpersonal development. This latter group attempted to implement the matching model process, and to approach collaborative supervision in a much more global way incorporating both theoretical and practical perspectives. For all participants, however, this Project significantly altered the views of principals and teachers regarding supervision. Baseline interviews and initial Project surveys revealed that participants possessed little knowledge of alternative supervision models. Likewise, knowledge of adult development, if any, was limited to the age related theories

popularized by Gail Sheehy's, PASSAGES and PATHFINDERS. (An exception was one principal who was familiar with Kohlberg's work on the stages of moral development.) None of the Project participants were familiar with the concept of action research, and none had experienced the process of collaborative action research. At the end of the Project, all participants had experienced the process of collaboration, and some had completed individual and/or group action research studies. A summary of both the content and process outcomes achieved in this Project and the various assessment tools used to document these outcomes is included in Table 5 of this report.

Individual Supervision Groups

One supervision group successfully collaborated together by focusing on a limited set of intern needs, and developing supervision strategies based upon their intuitive sense as experienced cooperating teachers. During the first two years, individuals in this group expressed strong reservations regarding the value of the content areas prsented by "outside experts." As a result, the group focused on their own practice base as teachers plus their previous experiences as cooperating teachers. Although they spent very little time or energy investigating theories of adult development or alternative models of supervision, these teachers were strongly committed to the process of collaboration. With the support and involvement of their principal, Project participants institutionalized a school-based supervision group open to all cooperating teachers as well as weekly meetings involving interns, cooperating teachers, and the university supervisor. Now incorporated into the structure of the school, these meetings and this spirit of collaboration seem quite stable for the future.

The second supervision group experienced the process of collaborative action research, gained significant knowledge in theories of adult development, and implemented several alternative approaches to supervision. After three years in this Project, these cooperating teachers are capable of matching their supervision strategies to the developmental needs of their supervisees. A sub-group of participants in this TSG also completed additional action research studies to document their findings relative to cognitive matching in the collaborative supervision process. One teacher's study focused on her supervision of undergraduate students in the Exploring Teaching course. Another teacher's study focused on professional self-development and how/why this approach to supervision matched her own stage of cognitive development. Two teachers experimented with a peer supervision model and documented their findings in terms of their own developmental

stages. Another pair of teachers focused their action research studies on the new roles which they had assumed, one as a Course Collaborator working with a university faculty member to supervise undergraduate students and the other as a Coordinator of Cooperating Teachers and Interns (CTI Role) working as a liason between the school district and the university. Consistent with the goals and objectives of this Project, each of these teachers significantly altered her view of the supervision process while applying her newly acquired knowledge about adult developmental stages.

University/Public School Collaboration

One direct result of this Project was the establishment of a University/Public School Task Force for Improved Supervision. Public school teachers and principals serve on this Task Force with university faculty members, supervisors, and the UNH Director of Field Experiences. Initially, this group assumed responsibility for collaboratively: identifying specific supervisory competencies; developing more immediate ways to translate research into practice; and sustaining an on-going dialogue between the public schools and the university. Organizationally, UNH has already made a strong commitment to implement the Task Force's recommendations regarding the cluster placement of both graduate interns and and undergraduate students enrolled in the Exploring Teaching course. Also, the university now recognizes cooperating teachers with specific training in supervision by paying them a higher stipend and providing dollars to support a new school-based poition called Coordinator of Teachers and Interns (CTI Role). The Task Force's decision to draft more than one possible description for this CTI position was a critical point in the development of this Project. Two possible approaches to this role were discussed and both were eventually adopted. Consistent with the collaborative nature and philosophy of this Project, Task Force members offered to each Teacher Supervision Group an opportunity to meet and decide which leadership approach best matched their own school context issues, staff develpment goals, and individual needs. Table 2 in the Appendix of this Report outlines these two approaches to the CTI Role.

Our findings indicate that this Collaborative Project in Supervision provided substantial changes from existing intern supervision practices at both the University of New Hampshire and the country at large. It also substantially increased the number of alternative approaches to supervision practiced by public school principals and teachers. From the beginning, this Project had the endorsement and support of key administrators and university faculty members responsible for

developing and managing the UNH teacher education program. It also had the endorsement of the local school superintendent, principals, and many public school teachers. As a school district employee, the Project Director assessed the climate of the schools on a regular basis, observed the interface between the Project and the school district, and spent a considerable amount of time reflecting with teachers and administrators about the impact of this Project on their district. Likewise, the Principal Investigator, as a full time faculty member at the university, interacted with her colleagues and administrators in a similar fashion. Communication between the Project Director and Principal Investigator was frequent, direct, and on-going throughout the life of this Project. In their final evaluation surveys and individual interviews, all participants cited the sustained commitment of the Project leadership as a key factor enabling both personal and organizational goals to be successfully achieved.

INSTITUTIONALIZED FEATURES OF THIS PROJECT

During the final meetings held with each of the Teacher Supervision Groups and the Principal Leadership Group, Project staff members discussed with all participants what features of this Project will continue after September 30, 1988. The Principal Investigator noted that several firm commitments have already been made by the UNH Education Department to institutionalize features of this Project. These commitments include:

1. Continuation and expansion of intern cluster placements within individual schools/districts.

2. Broadening the Project's original School/University Task Force to a group called the Public School/ University Collaborative on Teacher Education.

3. Continuation of an increased stipend from the University paid to cooperating teachers who have pursued formal training in supervision.

4. Monitoring of post-Project activities and practices in each Project school to collect longitudinal data, and to offer appropriate supports and challenges to all participants as needed.

5. Time and financial support to expand the concept and practice of collaborative supervision to other elementary and secondary schools which were not part of this original Project.

In terms of institutionalizing practices within the public schools, one principal emphasized her strong commitment to continue providing release time during the school day to enable cooperating teachers to meet on a regular basis. This practice proved to be highly successful throughout the Project in enabling cooperating teachers in one school site to share ideas, discover new strategies for working with adult learners, and sharpen their skills in peer teaching/supervision. Although not the case to date, it is hoped that other schools which participated in this Project may initiate similar release time options for cooperating teachers.

All Project participants expressed a strong commitment to continuing their involvement in the recently revised intern placement process. During this Project, a large number of public school cooperating teachers and principals were involved in the planning and implementation of a comprehensive process of intern placement which included a general orientation session, small group meetings, individual school site visits, conferences with the UNH Director of Field Placement, and final meetings with assigned interns and their cooperating teachers. Both the university and public school participants are strongly committed to refining and expanding broad based involvement in this process.

Along with the Principal Investigator and several Education Department faculty members, many Project teachers and principals are eager to sustain their involvement as members of the School/University Collaborative on Teacher Education. All participants see this group as a vital link between these distinct educational organizations, as well as a forum for establishing and testing new directions for the education profession.

PROJECT IMPLICATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Consistent with current research and practice in supervision, participants in A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION found that one "best" supervisory model does not exist. Instead, some system of differentiated supervision or a combination of several models responds most effectively to the individual needs of interns and teachers by providing them with a variety of supervisory options. Likewise, this Project

revealed that the most successful principals, cooperating teachers, and university faculty members were those able to match appropriate supervisory strategies to the specific needs and developmental levels of their supervisees. In reviewing the implications and lessons learned from this Project, the following three major areas of impact seem to surface: staff development, personal and organizational collaboration, and educational change.

Staff Development

In relation to staff development, a major implication of this Project is the powerful relationship between one's developmental stage and his/her ability to effectively participate in a collaborative action research team. Both the qualitative and quantitative data collected in this Project revealed that the cooperating teachers and principals functioning at higher stages of adult development: 1) sustained their participation for all three years; 2) made more significant contributions to the Project's success; 3) took greater risks, confronted issues constructively, and/or assumed new professional roles; and 4) acted as catalysts in attempting to institutionalize successful practices. The implication of this "lesson learned" reiterates the need for public school professionals and university faculty to collaborate on creating specific programs designed to promote the conceptual development of their peers. Staff members in this Project believe that such programs must include the following components:

1. Role Taking Experiences. Performing new or more complex interpersonal tasks than one's currently preferred modes of interaction; experiences are direct and active.

2. Guided Reflection. Systematic reflection following role taking designed to facilitate the cognitive restructuring process needed to integrate new learning with old patterns of thought.

3. Balance. Providing time for discussion, individual and group reflection, peer teaching/supervision, and role taking experiences.

4. Support and Challenge. Psychological and personal support to assume new roles, take risks, give/receive feedback, and overcome the dissonance or fear involved in developmental changes.

5. Continuity. Consistent, contructive, and focused feedback over a sustained period of time with opportunities for mentoring and networking.

Interviews with participants in this Project revealed that teachers are hungry for stimulating educational experiences. Several teachers reiterated that the process of collaborative action research provided a special kind of intellectual exhilaration which respected and empowered them as professionals. They also noted that it is difficult for them to think about traditional concepts of staff development or separate in-service activities now that they have experienced the breadth of creative alternatives for professional development presented to them in this Project.

Although not a new lesson, this Project caused all of us to reflect once again on the paradox involved in discussing teachers and power. When classroom doors close, teachers have enormous freedom to decide when, how, and why to teach a lesson. In this sense, they are powerful. Perhaps more than any other profession, however, teaching is practiced in isolation, and collegiality in most schools is non-existent. As Maeroff (1988) says, "Knowledge is the currency in which a teacher deals, yet the teacher's own knowledge [and practice] is allowed to become stale and devalued as though ideas were not the lifeblood of the occupation." Likewise, the Carnegie Forum (1986) reported that teachers are treated as if they have no expertise worth having, and that an endless array of policies succeed in constraining their judgments on issues that matter. Yet, we know that professionals have a sense of authority about what they do, and are recognized as experts in their fields. They feel good about themselves, and are respected by others. In this Project, we learned from direct observations and interactions that teachers and principals are truly empowered when they enjoy: the freedom to be creative and innovative; opportunities for feedback, recognition, and support; and the capacity to influence students, share with peers, and impact the future of their profession.

Personal and Organizational Collaboration

Examining the effective schools movement, Lezotte (1987) concluded that this concept was built on the idea of shared governance and assumes that change will come because people inside the schools decide to make the changes necessary to collaborate on issues and share roles. If this analysis is correct, perhaps the reason why the effective schools movement has not yet been transformed from an idea on paper to a viable practice is that there is neither shared governance in the

schools nor teachers/administrators committed to making the necessary changes for collaboration to occur. In this context, a difficult lesson learned from this Project was the current limitation of most of our institutionalized practices to University functions, roles, and processes. In order to clarify this point, a distinction must be made between personal and organizational collaboration.

> Personal Collaboration: educators working together to make the professional development of one or both more effective; colleagues using their collective knowledge, experience, understanding, and specific expertise to accomplish tasks and achieve goals.
>
> Organizational Collaboration: schools and/or educational institutions combining their resources and personnel to support staff development opportunities, achieve mutual goals, refine/expand educational practices, and impact the future of our profession.

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION taught us that effective collaboration must combine personal and organizational components in order to sustain its impact. Throughout this Project, principals and teachers were afforded many opportunities for personal collaboration. All of our documentation supports the collaborative action research process as the highlight of involvement for teachers and principals in this Project. Clearly, participation in a collaborative action research team is a powerful stimulus for personal and professional growth. Throughout this Project, staff members also facilitated a high degree of collaboration between the university and the specific public schools involved. Previous sections of this report dealing with Project outcomes and school/university collaboration have discussed the value and impact of this collaboration. Although initial support for this Project was expressed by all building and central office administrators in the school district, several factors, including significant staff changes during the life of the Project, altered this initial commitment/support. These alterations resulted in most of our institutionalized changes to date being initiated and/or sustained only at the university level. This lesson acknowledges that public schools and universities are separate educational institutions with different missions, roles, responsibilities, and administrative policies/procedures. If both personal and organizational collaboration is a goal, we learned that collaborators must work directly with those controlling the levers of power in each organization. For sustained collaboration between the staffs of public schools and universitites to occur, top level management support is

essential. In several exemplary school/university collaboratives like those in Louisville, KY; Queens College, NY; and Charlotte, NC, for example, the university president, superintendent of schools, and dean of the school of education meet and communicate regularly about joint efforts. Collectively, these administrators remove bureaucratic impediments to collaborative projects, provide incentives and resources, and recognize the value of such efforts by staff members. Perhaps when Lezotte's concept of shared governance in schools becomes the norm, teachers will control some of these levers of power. Today, however, this is not the case, at least in the schools where this Project was implemented.

Educational Change

Whenever public schools and universities work together, the process is one of constant change. Any attempt to control all of the details in such a collaborative school/university effort is like trying to bottle a cloud on a windy day. Perhaps this is why action research with its recursive quality is such a successful process in stimulating educational change.

Throughout this Project, each teacher supervision group created its own operational contexts which contrasted markedly with each other and sometimes with their own schools. Each team organized, operated, and developed norms and structures which responded to the specific needs of their members. In this respect, the process of collaborative action research emerged as much more significant than any of its products. Through this process, all Project participants shared a common body of knowledge about supervisory practices, enriched their understanding of how adults learn, and identified the conditions necessary to create a climate conducive to adult growth and development. Each of these components resulted in personal changes for the teachers and principals involved, as well as some institutional changes in the structure and format of the university's teacher education program. The potential also exists for substantial changes in the administration and governance of some public schools if participants are assertive and creative in collaborating with their colleagues and administrators.

Many of the recent reports proposing reforms for schooling in America have recommended "professionalism" as a goal. In the details of these reports and in the activities of many groups attempting to "professionalize" teaching, however, there seems to be an emphasis on techniques, strategies, and effective behaviors. In contrast, this Project encouraged the development of an inclusive, dynamic concept of teaching as a profession and teachers as professionals who assume many

diverse roles. Project participants sought growth and renewal through reflecting not only on their own classroom and supervisory practices, but also on the knowledge, beliefs, and values which underlie those practices. A major element of this reflective process was collegial dialogue. Information about how adults learn, for example, was juxtaposed against the teachers' reasons for using certain supervisory practices with their interns. Probing questions and discussion revealed that the selection of specific supervisory methods reflected both the teacher's own developmental stage and his/her belief about how other adults learn. Further individual and group dialogue, coupled with the use of reflective journals, supervisory logs, and the Competencies Checklist developed by Project participants, enabled teachers to begin linking their learning of adult developmental theory to their daily interactions with one another, with their interns, and with their own supervisors or principals. This reflective and interactive process represented a significant change in both the thinking patterns of participants and in the operational practices of all of the public schools involved in this Project.

PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

In addition to the dissemination activities reported in Table 3 found in the Appendix, the following products were developed by Project participants.

Year 2 Article and Presentation to the New England Research Organization (NEERO): EMPOWERING SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY STAFF IN A COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

Year 2 Presentation at the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and Publication of Same in ERIC: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

Year 2 Development of Field Test Version: A COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST IN ADULT DEVELOPMENT, SUPERVISION, AND COLLABORATION

Year 3 Two Articles Accepted for Publication in the Peabody Journal of Education: ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER IN COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION and ADMINISTRATIVE INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

Year 3 Article and Presentation to the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE): COOPERATING TEACHERS AS MENTORS IN THE COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

Year 3 Revision and Dissemination: CHECKLIST OF COMPETENCIES AND BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS IN ADULT DEVELOPMENT, SUPERVISION, AND COLLABORATION

Year 3 Two Articles and Presentations at Holmes Group Meetings: FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR COLLABORATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION and SIX AREAS OF SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

Year 3 Article and Presentation at National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD): DEFINING INDIVIDUAL ROLES IN A COLLABORATIVE ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT

The following articles and potential conference presentations are in progress:

Year 4 SEPARATE VS. CONNECTED INTERACTIONS IN A COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

Year 4 THE USE OF REFLECTIVE INQUIRY TO ENHANCE TEACHER AND SUPERVISOR EFFECTIVENESS

Year 4 ACCESSING POWER TO ACHIEVE COLLABORATIVE GOALS

Year 4 STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE MODEL FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

PHASES IN A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PHASE I - Development of Principal Leadership Group
(10-85 to 6-86)

GOAL: Investigation of adult development stages and discussion of alternative models of supervision.

OBJECTIVES FOR PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP GROUP

1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative research as one means of promoting personal and organizational development.
2. Brainstorm the possibilities for improving supervisory practices through public school-university collaboration.
3. Share information regarding adult developmental theory (cognitive, ego, moral judgment, conceptual and interpersonal) and major research studies on collaborative action research in schools.
4. Discuss and investigate various models of supervision (clinical, peer, group, scientific, developmental, differentiated, etc.)
5. Define role of school leadership participants in Phase II of this Project (Initiation of Teacher Supervision Groups).

Phase I - Development of Teacher Supervision Groups
(1-86 to 6-86)

GOAL: Increase the flexibility of selected classroom teachers by examining and demonstrating various models of supervision within the framework of adult cognitive/ development stages.

OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHER SUPERVISION GROUPS

The first four objectives below reflect the introduction to the collaborative action research methods and the models of supervision. The principals from the Leadership Group in Phase I continued to be involved here to add their knowledge, experience, and support to the Teacher Supervision Groups.

1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative action research.
2. Brainstorm the possibilities for improving supervisory practices through public school-university collaboration.

TABLE 1 (continued)

PHASES IN A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PHASE I - Development of Teacher Supervision Groups (1-86 to 6-86) (continued)	OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHER SUPERVISION GROUPS 3. Share information on adult developmental theory (cognitive, ego, moral judgment, conceptual, and interpersonal) and major research studies on collaborative action research with teachers and schools. 4. Discuss and investigate various models of supervision (clinical, peer, group, scientific, developmental, differentiated, etc.). 5. Structure Teacher Supervision Group meetings to include five conditions needed to promote developmental growth: . significant role-taking, . guided reflection, . balance of experience and discussion/reflection, . support and challenge, and . continuity-time (Theis-Sprinthall, 1979). Also include the four staff development training components researched by Joyce (1980): . describe model, . demonstrate model, . plan and peer teach model, . adopt/generalize model. 6. Improve/Refine the behavioral skills of teachers acting in the complex role of supervisors.

TABLE 1 (continued)

PHASES IN A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PHASE II - Teacher Supervision and Principal Leadership Groups - Demonstration (9-86 to 6-87)

GOAL: Refine the quality of supervision in a variety of school-based contexts (Internship, Exploring Teaching, peer, and principal/teacher) by applying and demonstrating the developmental framework for supervision explored by the Principal Leadership Group and Teacher Supervision Groups in Phase I.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Demonstrate the process of collaborative research as one means of promoting personal and organizational development and improved supervisory practice.
2. Facilitate the Cooperating Teachers' initiation of a series of interventions designed to match alternative supervision models to the supervisee's cognitive developmental levels.
3. Encourage effective Teacher Supervision Group meetings by attention to five conditions for staff development and four training components.

   Five conditions to promote developmental growth (Theis-Sprinthall, 1979)
   - significant role-taking
   - guided reflection
   - balance of experience and discussion/reflection
   - support and challenge
   - continuity-time

   Four staff development training components (Joyce, 1980)
   - describe model
   - demonstrate model
   - plan and peer teach model
   - adopt/generalize model

TABLE 1 (continued)

PHASES IN A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

PHASE III - Teacher/Principal Supervision Groups
- Demonstration and Dissemination
(9-87 to 6-88)

GOAL: Continue the Collaborative Principal Leadership and Teacher Supervision Groups focusing on demonstration and application of the supervision models and the matching of these models to developmental stages. Additionally, the activities of these groups will be based on new learnings from the reflection and analysis of their work during Phase II.

OBJECTIVES:

The third year of the project continues with the collaborative group meeting format and allows evaluation of:

1. teachers' success in matching alternative supervision strategies to graduate student teacher interns and undergraduate exploring teachers;
2. principals' success in matching alternative supervision strategies to their school's teachers; and
3. the collaborative process among principals, teachers, interns, university supervisors, and project staff.

The evidence will help the University Teacher Education Program and the School-University Task Force on Improved Supervision to make decisions regarding institutionalization of the developed practices at the elementary school level and extending the model to the secondary school level.

TABLE 2

SUPERVISION MODELS

In the differentiated staffing model one teacher is designated as a "cooperating teacher/supervisor" taking on significant supervision responsibilities with cooperating teachers and interns in the school building. In the egalitarian staffing model all cooperating teachers as a group in one building take on some expanded supervision responsibilities.

DIFFERENTIATED (CTS)	EGALITARIAN (Joint CT Group)
1. Supervise own intern, and do some supervision as requested by others (CTs, interns, principal, UNH supervisor).	1. Supervise own intern.
2. Meet individually and jointly with other CTs on regular basis.	2. Meet jointly with other CTs on regular basis, and occasionally with interns.
3. Meet individually and jointly with all interns on a regular basis and facilitate peer observations.	3. All CTs and interns plan mutual observations on a regular basis.
4. Use video and audio tapes to enhance supervision of all interns and increase communication among CTs.	4. Use audio and video tapes with own intern.
5. Negotiate with UNH supervisor re: shared role responsibilities.	5. Attend one or two intern seminars per year.
6. Attend intern seminars and jointly plan these with UNH supervisor.	6. CT representatives meet occasionally with UNH Supe Group.
7. Perform liaison functions between UNH and CT/interns.	
8. Locate people and material resources for teachers and interns.	
9. Meet with other CTs and occasionally with the UNH Supe Group.	
10. Act as a resource within school and district on issues of supervision and joint UNH/school projects.	

TABLE 3

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN SUPERVISION

DATE	ACTIVITY	AUDIENCE
1986-1988	Several Local Newspaper Articles on Project Progress	Community and Region
4/86	Workshop on Collaborative Action Research and Its Process in this Project (Rochester, NH)	Teachers and Administrators from Two Local School Districts
5/8	Presentation at UNH Joint Meeting of Prospective Interns and Cooperating Teachers	UNH Faculty, Public School Teachers and Administrators
10/86	Summary: Year 1 Activities Projected Timeline for Years 2 and 3 (Somersworth, NH)	All SAU #56 District and Administrators
2/87	Panel Presentation at AACTE: Overview of Project and Projected Outcomes (Washington, DC.)	Teacher Educators from 8 Different States
3/87	National ASCD Conference: Roundtable Discussion on Project Goals and Lessons Learned to Date (New Orleans)	Small Group of Teachers and Administrators from Several States
4/87	AERA Conference: Summary of Project to Date; Roundtable Presentation on Adult Development and Supervision (Washington, DC.)	Networking-All 29 OERI Projects; 8 Supervisors

TABLE 3

DATE	ACTIVITY	AUDIENCE
4/87	Panel Presentation at NEERO Conference: Project Overview and Expected Outcomes (Stratton, VT)	University Faculty and New England Researchers
5/87	NHASCD Conference: Discussion of Life Age and Life Cycle Approaches to Development (Concord, NH)	45 NH Teachers and Administrators
5/87	Conference at Harvard Principal's Center: Models of Adult Development Applied to Principal Decision Making (Boston, MA)	Regional Principals and University Faculty Members
8/87	Three Hour Presentation at Gifted Education Institute: Research Impacting Staff Development in Gifted Education (Merrimack, NH)	80 NH Teachers and Administrators
9/87	Full Day Workshop: Ages and Stages in Adult Development for NHSTA (Concord, NH)	36 Science Supervisors in NH Schools
10/87	Invitational Conference: Reflection in Teacher Education (Houston, TX)	20 Teacher Educators from Throughout the Country
10/87	Presentation at Annual Foster Grandparent Conference: Using Adult Development to Communicate Effectively (Somersworth, NH)	28 Members of NH Foster Grandparent Program; 5 Supervisors
10/87	Presentation at Northeast Regional Holmes Group Meeting: Future Prospects for Collaboration in Teacher Education (Boston, MA)	100 University Faculty from Northeast Holmes Group

TABLE 3

DATE	ACTIVITY	AUDIENCE
11/87	Presentation to School Board: Update of Project and Prospects for Institutionalizing Practices (Somersworth, NH)	School Board and Administrators
1/88	Staff Development Workshop: Broadening the Concept of Adult Development (Colchester, VT)	60 Teachers and Administrators
1/88	Presentation to Second Annual Holmes Group Conference: Six Areas of School/University Collaboration (Washington, DC.)	100 University and Public School Educators from National Holmes Group Members
2/88	Presentation at ATE Conference: Sharing Practices in School/University Collaboration (San Diego, CA)	Teacher Education Faculty from all States
3/88	Panel Presentation at Annual ASCD Conference: Defining Individual Roles in a CAR Project (Boston, MA)	40 Administrators, Teachers, and University Faculty from Several States
10/88	Presentation to School Board: Successful Project Practices (Somersworth, NH)	Board Members and Administrators

TABLE 4

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK IN COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION

1. Educators can use collaborative action research (also called Interactive R & D) to grow personally and professionally, developing skills and competencies which will empower them to solve problems and improve educational practice.
   References: Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin (1979); Little (1981); Hord (1981); Huling (1981); Griffin, Lieberman, & Jacullo-Noto (1983); Oja & Pine (1983, 1988); Ham (1983, 1985); Oja & Ham (1984); Oja & Smulyan (forthcoming).
2. Schools are the best laboratories for educational research; the integration of research and practice through collaborative action research can contribute to the development of schools as centers of inquiry.
   References: Schaefer (1967); Pine (1981); Wallat, et al. (1981); Mergendoller (1981); and above references.
3. Given an appropriate process, participant motivation, and time, it is possible to promote the cognitive growth and psychological development of educators through effective in-service programs.
   References: Oja (1978, 1980, 1985); McLaughlin & Marsh (1978); Little (1981); Huling (1982); Bents & Howey (1981).
4. Educators who function at higher cognitive developmental stages are more flexible, stress tolerant, adaptive, and generally more effective in their roles.
   References: Harvey (1966); Hunt & Joyce (1967); Silver (1973); Glassberg (1979); Oja (1978, 1988); Witherell (1978); Thies-Sprinthall (1981); Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall (1983).
5. The practice of educational supervision presently lacks a solid theoretical and research based framework.
   References: Shutes (1975); Lortie (1977); Ryan (1979); Alfonso & Goldsberry (1982); Haberman (1982); Lovell & Wiles (1983); Alfonso, Firth, & Neville (1984).
6. Effective supervision is dependent upon the consistency between one's espoused and practiced value systems of theories.
   References: Argyris & Schon (1974); Argyris (1976, 1982); McNergney & Carrier (1981); Glickman (1981, 1985).
7. Like teaching, instructional supervision is a highly complex task. It involves a broad base of knowledge regarding alternative supervisory models, as well as effective strategies for matching teacher needs to specific models.
   References: Blumberg (1980); Glickman (1981, 1985); Grimsley & Bruce (1982); Sergiovanni (1982, 1984); Grimmet (1983); Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall (1983); Cooper (1984); Glatthorn (1984).
8. Instructional supervision is recognized as one of the responsibilities of an effective principal. A variety of styles can be effective, but it is the match which is deemed most important. Rather than seeking a prescription for effective principal behavior, research needs to clarify how different styles and personalities interact with specific contexts and individuals.
   References: Blumberg & Greenfield (1980); Sizer (1983); DeBoise (1984); Ham (1985).

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF CONTENT/PROCESS OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENTS

A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

	Outcomes	Assessments
I. Knowledge		
1. Further study and investigation of adult cognitive developmental stage theories	.Increased knowledge and understanding of developmental theories	.Project Surveys .Supervision Competencies Assessment Inventory
2. Further study and research on a variety of alternative supervisory models and strategies	.Increased knowledge and understanding of alternative supervisory models	.Project Surveys .Supervision Competencies Assessment Inventory
II. Performance	Outcomes	Assessments
1. Increased use in the practice and analysis of audiotapes and videotapes	.Strengthened observational skills .Enhanced supervisory effectiveness	.Observation forms .Audio and videotapes
2. Refinement of the assessment inventory developed during Year Two, and practice in applying competencies identified in adult development, supervision, and collaboration	.Increased reliability and validity of assessment inventory	.Reviews by Outside Evaluators
III. Attitudes	Outcomes	Assessments
1. Application of developmental stage theory to participants' espoused and practices values	.Greater consistency between espoused and practical values .Acquisition and expression of a "spirit of inquiry" .Greater openness to the value of educational research, especially action research	.TSG Meeting Summaries .Reflective Journals .Focused Interviews
2. Extension of certain project activities designed to promote affective goals to include interns, peers, administrators and university faculty members	.Consistent reinforcement of attitudes/values implicit in project .Institutionalization of differentiated supervision practices	.Focused Interviews (end of Year 3) .Reflective Journals .Project Surveys .Observations
IV. Development	Outcomes	Assessments
1. Post-test assessments of the formal measures taken by TSG 1-2 participants	.Increased growth in ego, moral, and conceptual stages of development	.Sentence Completion (Loevinger) .Defining Issues Test (Rest) .Paragraph Completion (Hunt)
2. Self-Assessment on supervisory competencies inventory	.Development in ability to match supervision strategies to developmental needs	.Supervisory Competencies Assessment Inventory

Competencies and Behavior Indicators in Adult Development, Supervision, and Collaboration: The Supervisory Competencies Inventory

This Inventory can be found in the Appendix to Part B of The Final Report entitled Program Assessment Report: A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision.

To obtain the Supervisory Competencies Assessment Inventory and/or Part B of The Final Report, write or call:

Sharon Nodie Oja, Principal Investigator
University of New Hampshire
Department of Education
Morrill Hall
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595

[603/862-2379]

Formal Measures in Assessing Adult Development

(1) The Washington University Sentence Completion Test
(Loevinger, J. & Wessler, R., 1970)

(2) The Defining Issues Test of Moral Judgment
(Rest, J., 1974)

(3) The Paragraph Completion Method of Assessing Conceptual Level
(Hunt, D. E., Greenwood, J., Noy, J. E., & Watson, N., 1973)

To obtain copies of these adult development questionnaires and a review of the literature assessing their use, write or call:

Sharon Nodie Oja, Principal Investigator
University of New Hampshire
Department of Education
Morrill Hall
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595

[603/862-2379]

Practice Profile: A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision

See Part C of The Final Report entitled Practice Profile: A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision

To obtain the Practice Profile, write or call:

Sharon Nodie Oja, Principal Investigator
University of New Hampshire
Department of Education
Morrill Hall
Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3595

[603/862-2379]